Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed February 21, 2008.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed February 21, 2008, Claims 10, 13, 15-26, 28-29, 31, 34, and 36-39 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Claims 10, 13, 15-26, 28-29, 31, 34, and 36-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,058,958, hereafter Shutt) in view of Candan et al. ("*Enabling Dynamic Content Caching for Database-Driven Web Sites*", hereafter Candan).

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present Response amends Claims 10, 19, 29, 31, and 36-39, and cancels Claims 13, 28, and 34, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 10, 15-26, 29, 31, and 36-39.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action mailed February 21, 2008, Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, Claim 31 recited a machine readable medium. Accordingly, Claim 31 has been amended to recite a computer readable medium. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action mailed February 21, 2008, Claims 10, 13, 15-26, 28-29, 31, 34, and 36-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,058,958, hereafter Shutt) in view of Candan et al. ("*Enabling Dynamic Content Caching for Database-Driven Web Sites*", hereafter Candan).

Claim 10

Claim 10 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 10 defines:

10. (Currently Amended) A method for transferring content to a plurality of content repositories, comprising:

identifying a content in at least one of a file system and a website by traversing the at least one of a file system and a website;

associating a schema with the content;

communicating with a virtual content repository (VCR) via an Application Programming Interface (API) to provide the content and the schema to the VCR for inclusion in one or more of a plurality of content repositories, wherein the VCR integrates the plurality of content repositories into a logical content repository; and

storing the content and the schema in a node in one or more of the plurality of content repositories, wherein the schema is metadata that describes the node's properties;

wherein the API presents a unified view of the plurality of content repositories as a single repository and enables navigation of the plurality of content repositories;

wherein each content repository in the plurality of content repositories implements a Service Provider Interface (SPI) to integrate into the VCR; and

wherein the API and the SPI share a content model that represents combined contents of the plurality of content repositories as a hierarchy of nodes.

Claim 10, as amended, defines a method for transferring content to a plurality of content repositories, comprising identifying a content, communicating with a VCR to provide the content and the schema to the VCR for inclusion in one or more of a plurality of content repositories, and storing the content and the schema in a node in one or more of the plurality of content repositories, wherein the schema is metadata that describes the node's properties, wherein the API presents a unified view of the plurality of content repositories as a single repository and enables navigation of the plurality of content repositories, wherein each content repository in the plurality of content repositories implements a Service Provider Interface (SPI) to integrate into the VCR, and wherein the API and the SPI share a content model that represents combined contents of the plurality of content repositories as a hierarchy of nodes. Applicants respectfully submit that these features are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

.NET Framework Metadata

In the Office Action mailed February 21, 2008, .NET framework metadata used to manage components (column 11, lines 1-2) was cited as disclosing *associating a schema with the content* and *wherein the schema is metadata that describes the node's properties*. .NET framework metadata refers to certain data structures embedded within the Common Intermediate Language (CIL) code that describes the high level structure of the CIL code. The metadata is generated by the .NET compiler and stored in the CIL. When the Common Language Runtime (CLR) virtual machine executes the CIL code, the CLR checks a metadata associated with a particular method to ensure that the associated method is correctly called. (See *http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/.NET_metadata*).

Thus, when Shutt discusses that managed code using the .NET framework uses metadata "blueprints" for managing components, one of ordinary skill in the arts would understand that Shutt is clearly referring to the metadata generated during compilation that is used to, for example, locate and load classes, lay out instances in memory, resolve method invocations, generate native code, enforce security, and set run-time context boundaries, but that the .NET framework metadata referred to in Shutt clearly does not disclose *schema* ***asscciated with the content***, *schema that is* ***stored in a node in one or more of the plurality of content repositories***, nor does it disclose *wherein the schema is metadata* ***that describes the node's properties***. Even though Shutt uses the word "schema," there does not appear to be any mention of storing a schema in a node in a content repository or associating that schema with content.

Application Schema Neutral

In the Office Action mailed February 21, 2008, the phrase "the present invention is application schema neutral" in Shutt was cited as disclosing *the schema is metadata that describes a node's properties*. The phrase "the present invention is application schema neutral" clearly would mean to one of ordinary skill in the art that the present invention does not require and is not limited to a specific application schema. However, Shutt does not appear to disclose any schema that is ***associated with the content, stored in a node in one or more of the plurality of content repositories***, or ***describes the node's properties***.

Thus, read in context, the phrase "the present invention is application schema neutral" does not appear disclose a schema *that describes a node's properties*.

In addition, Claim 10 has also been further amended to more clearly define the

embodiment as comprising wherein the API and the SPI share a content model that represents combined contents of the plurality of content repositories as a hierarchy of nodes. It is respectfully submitted that this claim feature is also not disclosed by the cited references.

In view of the above comments, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 10, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 19, 29, and 31

For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 19, 29, and 31 are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-18, 20-26, and 36-39

Claims 15-18, 20-26, and 36-39 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 15-18, 20-26, and 36-39 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also respectfully submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 13, 28, and 34

Claims 13, 28, and 34 has been canceled by the current Response, rendering moot the rejections of these claims. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute the canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 21, 2008

By: /Guanyao Cheng/
Guanyao Cheng
Reg. No. 58,555

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800